

REMARKS

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of extending a telephonic interview on March 22 and an in-person interview on May 3, 2007. During the telephonic interview, claims 13 and 21 were discussed in view of the prior art. During the in-person interview, applicants' representative presented arguments and a proposed amendment to claim 13 similar to those in this Response. The Examiner indicated that the amendment requires further consideration. Thus, no agreement has been reached regarding the patentability of the claims.

Claims

Claims 13-34 were pending when last examined. Claims 1-12 had been cancelled. With the present response, claims 21, 26, 27, 31 and 32 have been cancelled, claims 13-20, 23-25, 28-30, 33 and 34 have been amended, and claims 35-37 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amendment can be found at least in FIGS. 2, 3 and 7-8 and in pages 3, 5, 8-10 and 12 of the specification.

Claim objections

Claims 27-28 and 32-33 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 27 and 32 have been cancelled and claims 28 and 33 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13-20, 23-25 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,735 to Gerace ("Gerace").

Claim 13, as amended, recites a method that includes storing user preference

information in a user profile about a multimedia consumer. The user preference information includes browsing preference information that describes the multimedia consumer's preferences for browsing audio-visual content, wherein the browsing preference information specifies (i) a plurality of browsing elements that include a first browsing element representing a visual key-frame summary, (ii) a first genre to which the plurality of browsing elements apply, and (iii) a respective preference value for each browsing element. The method further includes receiving an audio-visual content stream having content of the first genre, receiving user input that requests displaying content from the audio-visual content stream based on the user profile, and in response to the user input and based on the preference value for the first browsing element, displaying content from the audio-visual content stream by using the visual key-frame summary. The preference value for the first browsing element is updated based on the multimedia consumer's preference for the visual key-frame summary to browse audio-visual content of the first genre.

Gerace discloses psychographic or behavioral profiles that are based on users' viewing of agate information and are used to display advertisements for selected users. *See, e.g., Abstract.* Gerace, however, fails to disclose browsing preference information that describes the multimedia consumer's preferences for browsing audio-visual content. As the Examiner admitted, Gerace also fails to disclose a first browsing element representing a visual key-frame summary, as required by the claim. Gerace also lacks the claimed steps of receiving user input that requests displaying content from the audio-visual content stream based on the user profile, and in response to the user input and based on the preference value for the first browsing element, displaying content from the audio-visual content stream by using the visual key-frame summary. Lacking the visual key-frame summary, neither does Gerace disclose the claimed step of updating the preference value for the first browsing element based on the multimedia consumer's preference for the visual key-frame summary. Because Gerace fails to disclose at least these limitations, claim 13 should be allowable.

Claims 14, 19, 20, and 23 depend from claim 13, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 15 recites a method and claim 17 recites a system that have limitations similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 13. Because Gerace fails to disclose at least those limitations, claims 15 and 17 should be allowable.

Claims 16, 18, 24, 25, and 29-30 are dependent claims depending from claims 15 or 17, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 22, 28 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerace in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,236,395 to Sezan et al. (“Sezan”).

Claim 22 depends from claim 13, which recites receiving user input that requests displaying content from the audio-visual content stream based on the user profile, and in response to the user input and based on the preference value for the first browsing element, displaying content from the audio-visual content stream by using the visual key-frame summary. As discussed above, Gerace fails to disclose these limitations.

Sezan is also lacking. First, as the Examiner seems to admit, Sezan lacks the claimed preference value for the first browsing element. Second, although Sezan discloses key frames, it fails to disclose receiving user input that requests displaying content from the audio-visual content stream based on the user profile, and in response to the user input and based on the preference value for the first browsing element, displaying content from the audio-visual content stream by using the visual key-frame summary, as required by the claim. Instead of using the preference value for the first browsing element in the user profile, Sezan’s user has to select a particular key frame view each time he or she wishes to use key-frames (FIG. 9). Because, both Gerace and Sezan fail to disclose these limitations of base claim 13, claim 22 should be allowable.

Claims 28 and 33-34 are dependent claims whose base claims recite limitations similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 22. Because, both Gerace and Sezan fail to disclose these limitations, claims 28 and 33-34 should be allowable.

New Claims

Claims 35-37 are dependent claims which are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7493.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1597.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

5/17/07
Date

Lisa Lerner
Signature

Respectfully submitted,

By: Ferenc Pazmandi
Ferenc Pazmandi
Agent of Record
Limited Recognition No. L0078
FP/rp

May 17, 2007

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-1200